

Remarks/Arguments

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed May 6, 2005. Claims 1-4, 8-18 and 21-32 are pending in this case. Claims 12-18, 21-25 and 27-32 have been allowed. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9 and 10 have been rejected. Claims 2, 8, 11 and 26 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 2 and 8 have herein been amended. Claims 3-4, 9-18 and 21-32 remain unchanged.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 9-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cordery et al. (US 6,073,125) in view of Pickering Jr. et al. (US 6,557,755). For the reasons previously submitted in the prior amendment(s), which are herein repeated and incorporated by reference, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nonetheless, in the interest of passing this case to immediate allowance, Applicants have herein amended independent Claim 1 to include a limitation from allowable Claim 2, specifically, the step of verifying that said first tracing code corresponds to said second tracing code. As indicated by the Examiner in paragraph 6 of the

Office Action, the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest, "among other things, ... verifying that the first tracing code corresponds to the second tracing code;...".

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 are likewise now in condition for allowance as each of these Claims depends from amended independent Claim 1. Still further, it is respectfully submitted that allowable Claims 2, 11 and 26 are likewise now in condition for allowance as each of these Claims depends from amended independent Claim 1, either directly or indirectly.

Additionally, amended Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. As such, amended Claim 8 is likewise now in condition for allowance.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art of record, either alone or in combination, fairly teaches, suggests or discloses the novel and unobvious features of Applicants' claims as set forth herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that all of the claims as presented herein are now in condition for immediate allowance. An early notice allowance is respectfully requested.


Any arguments of the Examiner not specifically addressed should not be deemed admitted, conceded, waived, or acquiesced by Applicants. Any additional or outstanding matters the Examiner may have are respectfully requested to be disposed of by telephoning the undersigned.

A form PTO-2038 authorizing a credit card charge to cover the fee for one additional independent claim is enclosed. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional or deficient fees which may be required, including if necessary the above fee if there is any problem with the credit card charge, to Deposit Account No. 16-0657.

A postcard is enclosed evidencing receipt of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

PATULA & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Charles T. Riggs Jr.", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Charles T. Riggs Jr.
Reg. No. 37,430
Attorney for Applicants

PATULA & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
116 S. Michigan Ave., 14th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 201-8220